

Synthesis and comparative analysis of the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations within the CCAFS scenarios processes in all regions

Since 2010, the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) scenarios team has been leading several future scenario-guided policy formulation processes in all regions under the FP1 Flagship *Priorities and Policies for CSA*, combining both stakeholders' workshops and quantitative modelling to guide planning for food and nutrition secure futures under changing climatic conditions. While earlier scenarios focused on the regional level, since 2016 the scenarios processes have expanded to encompass a wide range of regional and national policy development processes. The second phase of the scenario project also stressed the integration of gender, youth issues and other social inclusion considerations within the scenarios processes with the wish to use "foresight as a mechanism for inclusion" (CCAFS, Planning cycle 2017, p. 1). Similarly, the planning for the second phase of the CCAFS scenarios processes put the emphasis on widening its geographical reach by reaching out to sub-national levels while giving more space for research and reflection on the foresight processes (CCAFS, Planning cycle 2017, p. 1). As part of CCAFS research and reflection objectives, one of the FP1 milestones for 2019 was to conduct a "Synthesis and comparative analysis of the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations within the CCAFS scenarios processes in all regions, in relation to process participation, empowerment, and equity considerations within resulting policies, strategies and investment plans". The following working paper takes stock of the ways gender and social inclusion considerations were considered in the scenario processes in all regions. This is done by first reviewing the relevant literature on participation before developing a framework for the synthesis and comparative analysis of the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations in selected case studies across all CCAFS regions. This provides the opportunity to take note of successes and challenges in addressing these issues within the CCAFS scenario processes.

The findings suggest the need to make the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations a priority from the onset in scenario-guided policy formulation processes. As this was not explicitly prioritized in this round of CCAFS scenarios, the team in the different regions adopted a learning by doing approach. The diverse case studies presented below bring forward some of the challenges to integrating gender and social inclusion, notably constraints of time, format, dedicated funding, and human resources. Critically, the demand-driven and often opportunistic nature of the policy development processes within which the scenarios were used can restrict the ability of the scenarios team to integrate gender and social inclusion considerations. Nonetheless, the use of scenarios was key to level the playing field during the workshops themselves thanks to a focus on the future and the use of highly participatory methods. The different case studies also bring forward good practices for integration such as planning for side consultations with often marginalised groups, longer engagement with relevant stakeholders which gives more flexibility or bringing in experts in gender and social inclusion and actively prompt for gender and social inclusion during the design of the scenarios. As the scenario processes become more popular and widely applied, the question of who is involved will continue to become more and more crucial. The following analysis takes note of the challenges and lessons learnt in the case studies in the five CCAFS regions before discussing the common points across and putting forward some recommendations.

Contents

Literature review	2
<i>Differentiated impacts, roles and capacities in a changing climate.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Defining and enabling "effective" participation</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Lessons learnt from efforts to include gender in environmental and climate policy-making.....</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>Participatory future scenario processes: practical implications and challenges</i>	<i>6</i>
Framework for analysis:	7
Methods:	10
Results:.....	12
<i>Latin and Central America scenarios:.....</i>	12
<i>Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage</i>	15
<i>Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content.....</i>	16
<i>Synthesis for the LAM region.....</i>	18
<i>West Africa scenarios:</i>	19
<i>Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage</i>	22
<i>Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content.....</i>	23
<i>Synthesis for the WA region.....</i>	25
<i>East Africa scenarios:</i>	26
<i>Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage</i>	27
<i>Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content.....</i>	28
<i>Synthesis for the EA region.....</i>	30
<i>South East Asia scenarios:.....</i>	31
<i>Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage</i>	32
<i>Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content.....</i>	36
<i>Synthesis for the SEA region.....</i>	36
<i>South Asia scenarios:.....</i>	37
<i>Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage</i>	38
<i>Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content.....</i>	41
<i>Synthesis for the SA region</i>	41
Discussion	43
<i>Process participation: gaps and opportunities.....</i>	43
<i>Inclusion of gender and social inclusion in content: gaps and opportunities</i>	45
Recommendations:.....	46

Literature review

From the mid-80s and building up in the 90s, further prompted by the failures of the structural adjustment programs to consider social factors, there has been a growing recognition of the need for more participatory approaches to policymaking and development planning (Mansuri and Rao, 2012). This is especially critical in the climate change field as top-down and technology-centred responses can obscure uneven capacities to adapt to changing climatic conditions and contribute to increasing the marginalisation of disadvantaged groups (Nightingale *et al.*, 2019; Rao *et al.*, 2019; Eriksen *et al.*, 2021). While the increased interest for participatory processes came along with more funding for such approaches, there remained, as Mansuri and Rao note (2012, p. 3), “little systematic effort to understand the

particular challenges entailed in inducing participation”. Similarly, while many now claim “participation”, the meaning of the word has become fuzzier (Cornwall, 2008). However, a growing body of literature has developed, seeking to better understand, enable, and inform participatory processes for policy making and development planning (Cleaver, 1999; Cornwall, 2008; Gaventia and Barrett, 2012; Mansuri and Rao, 2012). The following section takes notes of the literature on participation, looking especially at gender and social inclusion in climate policies and planning, starting from the identified needs and gaps before looking at lessons learnt, and challenges encountered. The final section will look especially at recent efforts at measuring the successes of participatory processes for development and planning, providing the basis for the development of the framework for this study.

Differentiated impacts, roles and capacities in a changing climate

With climate change’s negative impacts becoming more widely acknowledged and responses leading to many policy instruments to both mitigate and adapt, a growing body of scholars have expressed concerns over the top-down technological approaches frequently brought forward (Bassett and Fogelman, 2013; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015; Gonda, 2016; Howland, Le Coq and Acosta, 2019; Nightingale *et al.*, 2019). The focus on technologies to adapt and mitigate, as well as the framing of climate change as an emergency needing swift actions, all contribute to a lack of considerations of social differentiation and contextualized vulnerabilities such as gendered dynamics in climate policies and planning efforts (Gumucio and Rueda, 2015; Farnworth *et al.*, 2017; Howland, Le Coq and Acosta, 2019). In the mitigation field, the pressure for scaling up technical and institutional solutions quickly has been noted to lead to most low emission development projects rating gendered differentiated impacts and outcomes as secondary and as something to be addressed at the local level (Edmunds, Sasser and Wollenberg, 2013; Farnworth *et al.*, 2017). Rao *et al.* note that for adaptation, “nearly all policies aimed at developing and strengthening the adaptive capacity of local communities, fail to recognize the gendered nature of everyday realities and experiences” (2019, p. 14). Yet, gendered differentiated access, control and management of resources in everyday life leads to different capacities to adapt but also to different outcomes as efforts for adaptation can also deepen inequalities (Dankelman, 2010). In the agricultural field, for instance, unequal access to climate information can be a source of reduced capacities while climatic changes exacerbate pressures on households, notably by increasing workloads for women in rural farming systems who frequently lack resources to hire additional farmhands (Perez *et al.*, 2015; Huyer, 2016a). A study in Western Kenya also pointed out that women dairy farmers can resist efforts to increase productivity in milk production, a climate smart strategy to lower emission intensities, because of the loss of control over the milk income associated with formal sales compared to informally (Tavenner and Crane, 2018). Specific attention to entrenched discriminations in access and decision making is most often missing in policy documents while some of the solutions brought forward, such as increase involvement in commercialized production, can further disadvantage women (Gumucio and Rueda, 2015, p. 45). This leads to repeated calls for more inclusion of different “capacity, needs, and priorities” into policies as the failure to do so, impairs the setting up of mitigation and adaptation actions (Ampaire *et al.*, 2020, p. 44).

Yet, in climate policies, the inclusion of gender has been an especially lengthy process (Huyer *et al.*, 2020). Gender was first not considered altogether, including within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for twenty years (Farnworth *et al.*, 2017), while more recent efforts mentioning gender equality in relation to climate policy often do so at a superficial level which does not sufficiently consider and address root causes of inequalities (Huyer *et al.*, 2020). Most Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) mention gender and women in relation to increased vulnerabilities to climate change but stop short of considering differentiated knowledges, roles and agencies (Huyer *et al.*, 2020). The NAPs are noted to be doing slightly better which suggests a better understanding of gender dynamics in the adaptation field than in the mitigation sector (Huyer, 2016b; Huyer *et al.*, 2020). Women are also vastly underrepresented in the making of climate policies themselves with for instance the highest number of women ever participating in one of the IPCC bureaus being 8 at the time of Nhama and Nhamo’s study (2018), which represents less than 25% of the authors of the 2015 Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). The IPCC has since then actively tried to include more female participants, but the previously mentioned study shows that this remains well below gender parity and that actual participation, in terms of direct contributions to outputs, remains heavily skewed towards male contributors (Nhama and Nhamo, 2018).

While gender remains one of the most visible axes around which social differentiation occurs, scholars have also pointed out the interplay of multiple factors such as wealth, age, social groups or place of living which in combination leads to differentiated capacities and outcomes (Kaijser and Kronsell, 2014; Gonda, 2016; Huyer *et al.*, 2016; Rao *et al.*, 2019, p. 17). In particular, considering the intersectionality of factors is crucial to move away from a static understanding of gender and vulnerability and help consider the ways climate solutions' impacts is embedded in a specific context and culture (Gonda, 2016). This goes with an understanding of "the relationship between gender and the environment as a dynamic process in which culture and society play an integral role" (Gonda, 2016, p. 151). Social inclusion as a concept was then brought forward to help capture the "inter-related dimensions of inequality and disadvantage beyond poverty" (Arthurson and Baum, 2015, p. 2). By explicitly identifying excluded groups, it brings forward multiple facets of an issue to be considered for policymaking, ultimately leading to more well-rounded policies while challenging established power relations (Arthurson and Baum, 2015, p. 3; Huyer *et al.*, 2016, p. 11). But to ensure that participation in programmes does not only favours "the most literate, the least geographically isolated, and the most politically well-connected" (Mansuri and Rao, 2012, p. 6) as has often been the case, and with the potential of climate change and associated responses to deepen inequalities (Dankelman, 2010), it is crucial to pay attention to "who is participating, in what and for whose benefit" as participatory processes themselves can reinforce workings of exclusion (Cornwall, 2008, p. 269).

Defining and enabling "effective" participation

An important body of scholarship has looked at defining participation and looked at the different conceptualizations of its mechanisms and aims (Cleaver, 1999; Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999; Cornwall, 2008; Gaventa and Barrett, 2012). Many earlier attempts to increase participation focused on increasing participation in community projects and were sometimes criticized, for instance for increasing the labour burden of disadvantaged groups such as women taking on additional unpaid work within development projects, or pointing out the risk of reprisals for the groups meant to be empowered (Kabeer and Subrahmanian, 1996, p. 2; Gaventa, 2011; Mansuri and Rao, 2012; NORAD, 2013). Strikingly, the most common critique targets the easily made claims of participation which remains nonetheless, superficial in practice (Cleaver, 1999; Gaventa, 2011). To address these concerns and further push for inclusive processes, scholars have emphasised participation as inherent to citizenship, a "legal right" as Gaventa argues (2011, p. 72; Gaventa and Barrett, 2012). Merrifield in particular examines several cases where participation can be appreciated as a tool for citizenship education through the learning of rights for citizens, showing the potential of participation to build capacities (2002, p. 11).

As efforts to increase participation have increasingly turned towards encompassing policymaking and governance processes, two different arguments in favour of increased participation remain prevalent in the literature (Cleaver, 1999; NORAD, 2013, p. 6). On the one hand, one argument looks at it from an "efficiency" perspective, as more inputs contribute to better and more inclusive results (Cleaver, 1999, p. 598). Krizsan and Lombardo (2013) for instance note that it can also contribute to making implicit prejudices among the usually involved stakeholders more visible. On the other hand, others have emphasized the "equity and empowerment" argument, seeing participation as a way to empower disadvantaged groups (Cleaver, 1999, p. 598). This goes further than pushing for more consideration of differentiated local needs and priorities by actively becoming a way to counter social exclusion (Kabeer and Subrahmanian, 1996). At the centre is an understanding of empowerment as a "process", which stresses the "degree, types of participation, or sense of feeling powerful as agents rather than recipients of change" (Ransom, 2006, p. 44). The outcome is no longer strictly the policy developed itself but rather encompasses the development of capacities as well as the "satisfaction" and "growth" of individuals taking part as they develop a sense of "having an impact on policy and community change" (Ransom, 2006, p. 56). Cornwall notes (2008), that practically, multiple meanings and objectives can be found within a single endeavour but as Cleaver remarks (1999, p. 597), it is much more difficult to provide evidence of success for the second goal of participation.

This still raises the question of how to enable such participation in policymaking and critically, how to assess its successes and shortcomings (Mansuri and Rao, 2012). In their analysis of citizen engagement, Gaventa and Barrett note that more than looking at participation from a normative perspective, it is critical to analyse “the conditions under which it makes a positive difference” (2012, p. 2408). Studies looking at participation in policymaking have generally focused on assessing it from a process or a content perspective with the former focusing on the proceedings leading to the proposed policy while the latter scrutinizes what is recorded in the policy itself (Ampaire *et al.*, 2020). However, scholars focusing on content have especially focused on discursive analysis, for instance, the ways gender issues are written in the policies (Ampaire *et al.*, 2020, p. 47). The two approaches – process and content – are, however, not mutually exclusive as some have successfully combined both, arguing that taken together, they offer more information on the specific context within which policymaking takes place and participation will have an impact (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013). In particular, Ferree and Gamson, focusing on gender in governing processes, differentiates an “authority” dimension, the “gendering governance” through participation in governance process from an “autonomy” dimension, the “the governance of gender” conceptualized as “the substantive outcomes of the decision-making process” (2002, p. 35,36). Together, they form part of the empowerment of stakeholders for Krizsan and Lombardo (2013).

Lessons learnt from efforts to include gender in environmental and climate policy-making

With women’s and civil society groups more and more included in national policymaking processes (Huyer *et al.*, 2021), taking note of the literature on long-standing efforts to include gender considerations in policy-making yields valuable insights to consider to create an enabling environment for effective participation in the development of climate and agricultural policies (Chen, 1995; Ampaire *et al.*, 2016, 2020; Farnworth *et al.*, 2017). On the process side, scholars stress the need to pinpoint ahead of time women’s groups or specific individuals that can push forward gender issues in climate policies as well as to ensure their involvement in early stages while strengthening capacities for effective participation (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015; Mulema, Cramer and Huyer, 2021). Burns and Patouris’s technical guide of the UNFCCC texts for the Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO), which focuses on entry points and gaps for gender-sensitive climate policies, is an example of a text aiming to prepare participants for a UN conference – in this case, COP20 in Peru (2014). Moreover, one should also take note of the extent to which women’s groups and civil society groups are given sufficient authority during policymaking processes as well as pay attention to who is involved in terms of gender balance and expertise (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015). Capacities strengthening activities were also noted to be needed for stakeholders involved in the policymaking process to build awareness (Chingarande *et al.*, 2020; Mulema, Cramer and Huyer, 2021). This could mean targeting strategically well-positioned individuals and departments at different levels to ensure the need to consider gender and social inclusion issues is adequately recognized and lobbied for while ensuring that gender equality’s complex and multifaceted aspects are adequately considered (IUCN, 2011; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015, p. 46; Mulema, Cramer and Huyer, 2021).

On the content side, scholars highlight the need for gender to be integrated into every policies’ phases (Gumucio and Rueda, 2015; Ampaire *et al.*, 2020). The importance of a “diagnostic phase” in which the extent of what is known on gender inequalities is assessed is also stressed as well as assessing the national context and existing policy set-ups (IUCN, 2011; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015, p. 46; Huyer, 2016b). Chingarande *et al.*’s background paper on mainstreaming gender for adaptation planning also highlights the need for a gender analysis as the lack of data is reported as an important barrier for policymaking (2020, p. 16). Likewise, gender equality should be explicitly stated in the aims and the document should refer to the current policy environment surrounding gender equality before making explicit policy implementation plans and allocation of resources with dedicated indicators, including sex-disaggregated ones (IUCN, 2011; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015, p. 46; Huyer, 2016b). Ampaire’s studies of gender integration in Uganda and Tanzania’s climate policies also look at the budgeting for gender activities and associated monitoring as a way to evaluate how policies translated to impacts in the ground and the constraints to those (Ampaire *et al.*, 2020, p. 45). This goes in line with the recognition that attention to the interlinkages between climate change and gender also “necessitates efficient channelling of resources for successful interventions in the fields” (Chanana-Nag and Aggarwal, 2020, p. 24). Krizsan and Lombardo point out the need to look at the quality of gender equality policies by focusing

on the gendering, looking at the ways gender is expressed throughout the document in question and the consequences for inequalities within a long term perspective (2013, p. 82). Ampaire *et al.*'s content analysis strikingly found that both genders were depicted as "homogeneous groups delinked from other dimensions" with women "largely portrayed as marginalized and vulnerable without control over productive resources" which has important effects for implementation (2020, p. 55). Other quality criteria proposed are the extent to which a structural understanding is included and inequalities are understood to be intersectional (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013).

Participatory future scenario processes: practical implications and challenges

Fast-growing in popularity in the environment research and planning space, participatory scenario planning often combines quantitative scenario modelling and qualitative narratives to explore different imagined futures in a way that encourages long-term and broader system thinking (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015; Pereira *et al.*, 2021). Scenario planning exercises often bring together multiple stakeholders to develop scenarios and are growingly popular with governments seeking to think through uncertainties related to agriculture or food security in a changing climate (Wiebe *et al.*, 2018). As participating stakeholders have a strong influence on the creation of the scenarios and their associated narratives, paying attention to the composition of the room is key (Wiebe *et al.*, 2018; L Pereira *et al.*, 2021). A review by Oteros-Rozas *et al.* (2015) of 23 participatory scenario planning cases highlighted the strength of the approach in bringing together diverse stakeholders and facilitating a deeper understanding of socio-ecological systems and associated challenges, particularly in cases where workshops had been held at the local level and had involved historically marginalized groups (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015). Selection of participants is often considered at the operationalisation stage of the process and is usually guided by the overall objectives of the scenario workshops which are noted to be mostly "process-oriented", seeking to empower participants, encourage innovation and social learning as well as integrating differentiated views and perceptions (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015, p. 2; Pereira *et al.*, 2019). Yet, scholars have highlighted the challenges to involving an adequate diversity of participants and continuing that engagement over a longer time frame (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015, p. 9; Pereira *et al.*, 2021). In particular, challenges regarding diversity were noted to be both the difficulty to engage with high-level stakeholders who are key to decision-making or possess high economic power and the difficulty to include marginalized groups with less authority, noting in particular gender imbalances (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015). Difficulties to engage with indigenous communities were also identified in some cases due to "cultural barriers" (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015, p. 9). The need to cater for and include contrasting views in the scenario building activities in particular was highlighted with different methods brought forward to facilitate these at different scales (Laura Pereira *et al.*, 2021). Yet, as Pereira *et al.* note (2019, pp. 11, 15), "some form of power will inevitably enter into the convened space, including potential conflicts arising from pre-existing tensions or prejudices", which points out the need to acknowledge historical bias and power relations, as well as ethical dilemmas, and reflect on those as they affect scenario processes.

The above sections reviewed the ways participation in policy processes is understood and discussed in the literature, paying specific attention to the ways participatory processes have been evaluated and lessons have been drawn, including from efforts to integrate gender in environmental policies as well as diversity concerns in scenario processes. This literature feeds into the development of the framework used for this study. Yet, as Cornwall notes (2008, p. 276), full participation, while often claimed to be, is never fully possible, making the aim to be "optimum participation" with a focus on participation from a processual perspective for more social justice. Moreover, any attempts to assess successes and failures of participation needs to be grounded in an understanding of the specific context within which it occurred, otherwise running the risk of insufficiently recognising the extent of the progresses made (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013). Similarly, as the case studies are all future scenarios processes, the specificity of that particular format and its associated constraints also need to be acknowledged and considered in the analysis. Finally, scholars in the field point out the need for more research on the ways participation is enabled and enables more inclusive results by seeking to be explicit on the frameworks developed to assess participation (Cornwall, 2008).

Box 1: Definitions:*Gender:*

“Gender refers not to male and female, but to masculine and feminine - that is, to qualities or characteristics that society ascribes to each sex. People are born female or male, but learn to be women and men. Perceptions of gender are deeply rooted, vary widely both within and between cultures, and change over time. But in all cultures, gender determines power and resources for females and males” (FAO, 2011b) in (FAO and CCAFS, 2013, p. 9).

Gender equality:

“As defined by the United Nations, gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Gender equality is seen as not only a fundamental aspect of human rights and social justice, but also a precondition to improve the development process by putting social concerns at the centre (OSAGI 2001). It is characterized by equal participation of women and men in decision-making, equal ability to exercise their human rights, equal access to and control of resources and the benefits of development, and equal opportunities in employment and all other aspects of their livelihoods (FAO and CCAFS 2013)” in (Huyer et al., 2016, p. 10,11).

Gender equity:

“Fairness of treatment for women and men according to their respective needs. A gender equity goal often requires measures to rectify the imbalances between the sexes, in particular, to compensate for the historical and social disadvantages of women. Equity can be understood as the means, where equality is the end. Equity leads to equality” (IFAD, 2017, p. 9).

Social Inclusion

“Social inclusion involves gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, disability and age (youth and seniors) and affects dynamics around perspectives, needs and access to resources (FAO and CCAFS 2013). The World Bank defines social inclusion as improving the ability, opportunity and dignity of people disadvantaged on the basis of their identity to take part in society” in (Huyer et al., 2016, p. 11).

Framework for analysis:**The specific objectives of this framework are to**

- Evaluate the degree of integration of gender and other social equity considerations within CCAFS scenario processes across all regions.
- Compare successes and shortcomings between scenarios processes while taking into account specific contexts.
- Learn from best practices while identifying gaps and opportunities for further integration.

Scope

Regions	Countries	Focus of the scenario processes (year)
LAM	Central American Integration System (SICA in Spanish)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy for the SICA Region (2018-2030)
	Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NDC enhancement process in (2015) Sectoral agreement for reduction of emissions in agricultural and forestry sector (2017) NDC enhancement process (2020)
	Honduras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the SAG strategy (2014)
WA	Burkina Faso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Plan for the Rural Sector of Burkina Faso (2015)
	Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the Livestock policy (2016)
	Niger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livestock sector plans (2019)
	Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision of the National Environmental Policy (2015)
	Rwanda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the Livestock Master Plan (2019)
SEA	Cambodia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Plan for Agriculture - Climate Change Priorities Action Plan (2014/2015) Supporting Cambodian climate negotiators for COP (2019)
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy training, test of 2030 Vision of the Agriculture sector (2020)
SA	Bangladesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central development plan 7th Five Year Plan (FYP), planning for agriculture, climate change and food security Zero hunger / Zero emissions project

The following table give some indication on the variables considered for analysis. However, the material available for each case vary and, in some instances, the scenarios happened a few years ago which challenged retrieval of information as not all information is available for each case. Instead, the analysis follows a more holistic approach which takes notes of the successes, and challenges to wider participation at the planning and implementation part, including the context for the selection of participants, facilitation team, methods used and outputs.

Table 1

Variables considered

<i>Level of integration at planning stage</i>	<p>Problem identification</p> <p>Who was leading the selection of participants?</p> <p>What was the main goal of the scenario process?</p> <p>Were there strategies developed to push for inclusion of more diverse participants?</p> <p>Facilitation</p> <p>Who facilitated the scenario workshops?</p> <p>Did the training of facilitators include a part on gender and social equity considerations?</p> <p>Were strategies put in place during the workshops to ensure efficient participation?</p>
<i>Level of integration at implementation stage</i>	<p>Process participation</p> <p>Nb of women / % of participants</p> <p>Nb of representatives from women's organizations / % of participants</p> <p>Seniority/level of women participants?</p> <p>Nb of representatives from youth organizations / % of participants</p> <p>Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion</p>
<i>Level of integration in content – see table below for grading</i>	<p>Strategy, plan or policy content</p> <p>Were social equity considerations explicitly prioritised in this scenario process? If yes, which ones were centred?</p> <p>Extent to which gender considerations were considered within scenarios, recommendations from the workshop, targets, budget allocation</p> <p>Extent to which youth specific considerations were considered within scenarios, recommendations from the workshop, targets, budget allocation</p> <p>Extent to which socio-economic disparities related issues were considered within scenarios, recommendations from the workshop, targets, budget allocation</p> <p>Extent to which disabilities related issues were considered within scenarios, recommendations from the workshop, targets, budget allocation</p> <p>Extent to which geographical disparities were considered within scenarios, recommendations from the workshop, targets, budget allocation</p> <p>Intersectionality of factors considered? Portrayal of gender issues?</p>

Drawing from (Howland, Le Coq and Acosta, 2019) / (IUCN, 2011) / (Krizsan and Lombardo, 2013; Gumucio and Rueda, 2015)

Table 2

Level of integration	Description	Score
Extensive	Mentioned throughout the document with a clear implementation strategy and with some planned allocation of financial resources.	4
Good	Mentioned in several instances in the document with set targets or indicators but without allocation of financial resources.	3
Partial	Mentioned in the scenarios and in the recommendations from the workshop but without an implementation plan.	2
Limited	Mentioned briefly in at least one of the original scenarios created but absent from other sections.	1
None	Not referenced in the documents consulted.	0

Adapted for the scenario-guided workshops from the grading system developed by (Gumucio and Rueda, 2015, p. 47; Ampaire *et al.*, 2020, p. 48)

Methods:

To apply this framework, a first round of exploratory interviews was conducted with the CCAFS team leaders in all regions to identify the cases to consider and documents available on the scenario processes. The documents were then reviewed before conducting a second round of interviews with the CCAFS team leaders and additional members of the CCAFS team to discuss the cases more in details.

Qualitative interviews with individuals from the CCAFS scenario team in all regions were done in English using online communication tools, namely Zoom and Microsoft Teams. The interviews were recorded and afterwards transcribed. The interviews focused on discussing the context of each scenario processes selected for analysis, including factors that weighted in for the selection of participants, organization of the workshops and methods used. The interviews also aimed to provide some space for reflection on successes and challenges surrounding the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations in scenario processes. Some of the scenario processes were done a few years ago which sometimes challenged recollection of specificities.

As each scenario process was unique, the output documents and information gathered varied significantly from case to case. In some cases, information on the gender of participants was directly collected while in other it was not. In the latter case, genderize.io was used to assess the gender of participants based on the first names. Genderize.io has been used in multiple studies and rely on frequency to assert the likelihood of a name being more likely to be associated with women or men. Unfortunately, this also means that a margin of error is likely. For the categorization of organization, only national organization who presented a clear upfront goal towards addressing gender and social inclusion issues were categorized in the “national organizations working on social inclusion”. Unfortunately, the age of participants was often not retrievable.

The content analysis part is based on analysing the output documents for each scenario process, firstly considering the national scenarios refined and used before looking at the recommendations made on that basis for the policy under discussion. In cases where the scenario process was seen as having heavily played a role in the formulation of a specific

policy, the policy was also analysed but its results are marked with * in the result table to indicate that while linked to the scenario process, it is the actual policy that is being reviewed and limited inferences can be made to the extent that the scenario process influenced the final text on these specific elements. The first table in each section clarifies the documents consulted. Following Table 2 and the grading system, each scenario process was scored. The results table also detail on the way that gender and social inclusion considerations were referred to as it allows for synthesis on the ways these issues are presented across and between the cases.

In line with the definition of gender reported earlier in this study, this study recognises gender as being more than sex and being men or women but as comprehending diverse identities and sexual orientations as well as the “social norms, attitudes and activities that society deems more appropriate for one sex over another” (Nhamo and Nhamo, 2018, p. 5). However, for the purpose of analysis and based on the data available which does not allow to incorporate in depth reflections on the attention paid to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, asexual and other identities (LGBTQA+), this study considers gender in a mostly limited way. For instance, when assessing the integration of gender in participation, the genderize.io tool identify participants as women and men only and is not based on participants’ own self-identification. Similarly, almost none of the scenario processes touch on LGBTQA+ issues in content and this must be understood in the contexts of the countries in which these workshops took place as most do not allow for open discussions on and integration of diverse gender identities. A notable exception is the case of Costa Rica as is further presented in the results section.

Results:

Latin and Central America scenarios:

In Latin America, five scenario-guided policy formulation processes were selected for analysis. Table 3 presents these scenarios workshops, giving more information on their primary purpose, the context, selection of participants, facilitation team and main output documents considered for each scenario process.

Across all cases in the CCAFS Latin America region, the workshops were used to review policies or planning documents in the preparatory stage. While four national scenario-guided policy formulation processes and one regional process are considered further for analysis, the regional scenarios created in 2013 for Central America laid the ground for future work in the region by introducing the future scenarios methods to many national stakeholders, building relationships, and deciding on overarching themes at the regional level through the creation of regional scenarios. The regional scenario process focused on the future of agriculture, considering dynamics related to climate change, food security, environment, and livelihoods. In most instances, the regional scenarios for Central America were then used during the workshops held at national levels, adjusting the scope to the country's context and the variables addressed in the policy to stir discussions and reviews of proposed policy in each country. The regional scenarios thus also already set an agenda on several topics, some relevant for the consideration of gender and social inclusion issues, for instance by putting the distribution of wealth among the four drivers of change considered or by pointing out the possible role of the large scale corporations appropriating natural resources and increasing inequalities and raising the issue of marginalized communities not being much included in decision-making.

Table 3

Scenario guided process (Year)	Primary purpose	Context	Selection of participants	Facilitation	Nb of participants	Main documents considered
Honduras – improvement s on the SAG strategy (2014)	Participatory process to review and improve the SAG strategy under development	The Ministry of Agriculture contacting CCAFS to do a review of the policy drafted by a team of consultants.	Government led selection of participants with guidance of selection criteria from CCAFS.	CCAFS, UCI & SAG team.	40	Scenarios developed and workshop report.
Costa Rica – INDC (2015)	Participatory process to support the development of the Intended Contributing to the enhancement of the Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC) for Costa Rica.	Wish for a participatory process that that explores uncertain futures, to prevent discussions about emissions data and complement model based approaches. Joint effort from CCAFS, UNDP and the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE).	The ministry selected participants based on previous activities. CCAFS gave selection criteria.	MINAE INDC team & UCI.	37	Narratives of the future guiding the development of Costa Rica's INDC.
SICA – Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy for the SICA Region (2016)	Participatory process led by the the Central American Agricultural Council (CAC) to support the development of the Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy (2018-2030) for the Central American Integration System (SICA).	Wish for a participatory process to support the development of the strategy. SICA is formed by Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Belize and the Dominican Republic.	Led by CAC, involving the regional technical agriculture committees set up by SICA.	CAC & UCI.	34	Scenarios developed and CSA strategy.

Costa Rica – sectoral agreement for reduction of emissions in agricultural and forestry sectors (2017)	Elaboration of an inter-institutional binding agreement between MAG and MINAE, based on a future vision for the reduction of emissions in the agriculture and livestock sector.	Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Energy request for a participatory process following the 2015 NDC process.	Participants selected by the two ministries, with guidance of CCAFS in selection criteria.	MAG, MINAE, UCI	41	Report on the future scenarios workshops to guide the agriculture sector in its transition towards a production that is resilient to climate variability and low in emissions
Costa Rica – INDC (2020)	Contributing to the enhancement of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) for Costa Rica.	Need for enhancement of the country's NDC following international agreements. Covid19 pandemic bringing forward issues of social inequalities.	NDC team with clear vision of broader and more inclusive participation in the NDC enhancement process. CCAFS contributes to the selection criteria of participants.	UCI & MINAE NDC team	More than 350 total Phase 1 (217) Phase 2 (160)	NDC 2020 final report and Outcome impact case report.

Table 4

Scenario (Year)	Nb of women (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from women's organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from youth organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion
Honduras (2014)	3 (7.5%)	1	2 (5%)	8 (20%)
Costa Rica (2015)	11 (31.43%)	/	/	/
SICA (2016)	17 (50%)	/	/	3 (8.82%)
Costa Rica (2017)	15 (29.73%)	/	/	1 (2.44%)
Costa Rica (2020)	Phase 1: 115 (53%) Phase 2: Sector 1: 33 (53.23%) Sector 2: 30 (60%) Sector 3: 20 (54.05%) Sector 4: 15 (46.88%) Sector 5: 19 (42.22%)	/	15/20 participants from youth organizations	/

As the above table presents, only two workshops, the 2016 SICA CSA policy workshop and the 2020 Costa Rica NDC workshop, had an equal number of men and women participating in the process while two were in the 30% range and one with less than 10% of women participants. For the SICA CSA scenario-guided policy formulation process, participants were representatives from the region, from ministries of agriculture and environment working in climate change as well as from technical groups focusing on climate change and risk management working under the SICA structure. CCAFS had an active role in the selection of participants thanks to its continued involvement in the SICA policy development process. The other four scenario workshops were organized at the demand of specific ministries in Honduras and Costa Rica and based on topics related to agriculture and/or climate change. They did not comport an explicit focus on gender and social inclusion issues. As the impulse to organize these future scenarios workshops was demand-led to review or accompany a policy process, the different ministries primarily led and decided on participants selection. This can make it difficult for participants to be included beyond the main stakeholders first identified by the governments' ministries or departments and impacts the diversity of participants present during the workshops. The CCAFS team nonetheless reflects that it always strives to stir towards wider inclusion by reviewing in advance and suggesting improvements on the participants lists shared by the ministries, advancing the argument that more diverse participation results in better policies.

In some cases, stakeholders from the government explicitly desired to include specific groups such as in the case of the review of the SAG strategy in Honduras, where the Ministry of Agriculture wished to include smallholder farmers in the future scenario workshop to ensure the policy would address their needs. This could explain why this process scores

higher than the others regarding the presence of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion issues. The CCAFS team also noted that it was easier to include women's organization as the workshop happened at the local level. For the 2020 enhancement process of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) in Costa Rica, there was an explicit wish from the NDC team to facilitate wider participation from the beginning. In this case, the planning and implementation of the workshops coincided with growing consciousness of rising social inequalities in the country, highlighted especially during the COVID19 pandemic. This was instrumental in expanding considerably participation with youth, activists, elderly, and indigenous groups in the NDC enhancement process. CCAFS also supports financially when needed, and depending on the funding available, transport or accommodation for participants to attend the workshop as was the case for certain individuals invited to attend the 2014 Honduras workshop.

Workshop facilitators in the CCAFS Latin America region often comprised the CCAFS team in combination with a few selected individuals from the ministries / departments partnered with. While the training for facilitators did not contain a specific component on gender and social inclusion issues, the training emphasized the active role of the facilitator in opening the space for discussions and highlighted different ways to encourage effective participation from all present stakeholders.

“What we always indicate is that there are many different people in a scenarios workshop and one of the most important roles of a facilitator is to make sure that everybody can say something and that all opinions are important” (*CCAFS team, LAM region*)

Methods to promote inclusive dialogues included for instance switching to individually writing on sticky notes before coming together as a group, alternating between talking and writing with facilitators able to help specific participants, or working in pairs to define factors of change and individual rating exercises such as was the case in the 2017 Costa Rica workshop. However, the CCAFS leading team noted that often the consideration of gender and social inclusion concerns is curtailed by lack of time in what are already fast-paced workshops. In the case of the 2020 NDC enhancement process in Costa Rica, a consultant on gender issues was hired by the NDC team to help plan and facilitate the integration of gender and social inclusion during the workshops. Initially, the idea was to add specific drivers of change with gender and social inclusion elements to the scenario creation process, but this was abandoned due to lack of time:

“What she did in the end was that in every group that she participated she would always ask things that were related to gender so “what does this mean for women” or “what does this mean for youth”, how do you imagine them in this scenario” (*CCAFS team, LAM region*)

During the workshops themselves, participants are also divided into smaller groups decided in advance to represent a variety of stakeholders. However, gender and social inclusion concerns are not necessarily the main criteria when deciding on the groups composition as diversity of stakeholders was mainly considered in terms of activity, for instance ensuring to mix representatives from different government ministries and department, universities, or from the private sector. Moreover, while many efforts are made to open the workshops to diverse stakeholders not usually involved in decision-making such as indigenous groups in Latin America, the structure of the workshops themselves, being held for long hours in hotel rooms for instance, might not be what specific groups are used to which can limit their capacity to meaningfully take part. For the 2020 Costa Rica INDC enhancement process, separate consultation with elderly and indigenous groups was necessary due to the virtual set up for all sessions.

Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content

Table 5

Elements considered Case	Gender(s)	Youth	Socio-economic disparities	People living with disabilities (PLWDs)	Geographical disparities	Conclusions and cross sectional reading by participants relevant to G&SI.
Honduras – improvements on the SAG strategy (2014)	1 – only mentioned briefly in the notes used for one of the scenarios adapted.	2 – mentioned in the scenarios and in the output document with no set targets.	2 – mentioning need to increase resilience for most vulnerable communities, supporting smallholders and poorest communities with difficult access to resources but no set targets.	0 – no mentioned	3 – explicit mentioning of need to validate measures in several regions and target to increase resilience in most vulnerable communities as well as territorial ordering through agricultural zoning and associated allocation of resources.	Emphasis on participatory methodologies and need to adapt to local realities by area, working with young people and including local actors and knowledges.
Costa Rica – INDC (2015)	0 – not mentioned in scenarios / *1 – mentioned greater CC impacts on women in the submitted INDC	0 – not mentioned	1 – considering rising inequalities related to private sector capture of resources, for instance price of water / *1-mentioned greater CC impacts on poorest in the submitted INDC	0 – not mentioned	1 – Reference to migration from rural areas to cities	Emphasis on need for regulation to ensure fair access to resources.
Costa Rica – Agricultural vision 2030 (2017)	1 – participation of women in productive activities added as a variable	2 – participation of youth in productive activities added as a variable and mentioned in scenario, emphasis on encouraging new generation in recommendation	2 – gap between rich and poor mentioned in scenarios and different farm scales mentioned in recommendations	0 – not mentioned	2 – considering rural urban migration, different scales, and diversity of agroecological conditions	Emphasis on need for education, training and strengthening capacities.
Costa Rica – INDC (2020)	*3/4 – Mentioning women, rights of transgender, emphasis on setting up social dialogue, capacity building in targets through training for green jobs, targets for integration. Mention of a budget for the recognition of productive spaces of rural women	*3/4 – mentioning youth, emphasis on setting up social dialogue and capacity building in targets through training for green jobs, targets for integration	*3/4 – considering most vulnerable communities, indigenous, afro-descendants, elderly, emphasis on social dialogue and integration of different worldviews and knowledges, capacity building for green jobs	*3/4 – mentioning people living with disabilities, targets for integration in dialogue and empowerment	*3/4 – recognition need to close the social and territorial gaps and consider different territories and communities, in particular targets for highly populated areas and different regions and scales	From start to finish, emphasis on solidarity, inclusiveness, equality for social and climate justice. Advocating for intersectional perspective and empowerment with targets for disaggregated data on different groups.

Results from the above table show that while most scenarios documents mentioned gender, youth, and social disparities, these references remain mostly at a superficial level with few specific indicators or targets decided on and written in the outputs considered, with the 2020 Costa Rica NDC enhancement process a notable exception. Geographical disparities were the most often mentioned with all cases referring to agroecological differences and consideration of rural-urban dynamics. For the Honduras case, the location of the workshop, in Choluteca, one of Honduras' regions most vulnerable to climate change, and presence of smallholders' farmers and agronomy students might be an element of explanation regarding the medium to high consideration of youth, geographical and social disparities in the scenarios and outputs.

Interestingly, generational dynamics with references to the youth were more likely to be mentioned than gender dynamics in all cases except for the 2015 Costa Rica NDC enhancement process in which references to youth issues were also absent and in the case of 2020 Costa Rica NDC process which considered both. Most references to youth were linked to the need for training and capacity building. Specific attention to issues related to people living with disabilities was missing in all but one scenario process.

The Costa Rica 2020 NDC enhancement process is the one scoring the highest for all categories, reflecting its high consideration of gender and social inclusion issues. The NDC policy document is the only output which considers intersectionality of social positions as well as take a non-binary approach to gender by referring explicitly to sexually diverse populations and rights of transgender. It also considers persons living with disabilities and presents disaggregated data – as well as plan for the collection of the same. The NDC also clearly mentions and aligns with existing policy framework for gender, youth and climate change for instance mentioning the fore coming Action Plan for Gender Equality and Change Climate. While the final document presents some lead in setting aside a budget, it does not yet contain a specific budget line for each target set out and concludes that more resources are needed for implementation which is why the grade of 4 was not fully given in this case.

Synthesis for the LAM region

Gaps

- The demand driven rationale for setting up the workshops complicates the capacity to influence selection of participants, especially towards including non-governmental groups and individuals.
- Diversity in participants is often considered in terms of sectors and not necessarily following gender / social inclusion criteria.
- Lack of time is often the major factor in preventing the in depth exploration of gender and social inclusion issues during the scenario workshops, this result in superficial consideration in most output documents.

Opportunities

- Many efforts are made towards including more diverse stakeholders, mainly towards facilitating inclusive discussions during the workshops themselves through multiple methods aimed at creating space for different stakeholders to express themselves even with unequal power relations between actors.
- Specific prompts on gender and social inclusion issues during the discussions are instrumental in pushing for the consideration of these issues across several themes.
- Separate side processes can help engage diverse stakeholders in different ways such as with elderly people in the case of the 2020 INDC enhancement process which was done online.

West Africa scenarios:

In West Africa, three scenario-guided policy formulation processes were considered for analysis (see Table 4). As was the case with the CCAFS Latin America region, the CCAFS regional scenarios developed at a regional level for Western Africa, developed between 2010 and 2012 during four workshops, provided the basis for the national level scenarios workshops which were then adapted for each country. The regional scenarios already set out two main questions to be considered, namely on the actors driving the change and the time priority of policies for thinking through food security, environments, and livelihoods issues. While two of the scenario processes considered used the scenario approach with the aim to review and update existing policies – considering new challenges and opportunities – such as the Burkina Faso’s national plan for the rural sector and the Niger’s Livestock Policy, the scenario process in Ghana was used to review a new policy for the livestock sector in its final stage of development.

Table 6

Scenario guided process (Year)	Primary purpose	Context	Selection of participants	Facilitation	Nb of participants	Main documents considered
Burkina Faso – National Plan for the Rural Sector of Burkina Faso (2015)	To review the National Plan for the Rural Sector of Burkina Faso (2016-2020)	Since 2013, joint initiative to strengthen linkages with CGIAR and non-CGIAR actors working in rural sector led by the SP/CPSA (Secrétariat Permanent de Coordination des Politiques Sectorielles Agricoles). As a part of this, a workshop organized focusing on the revision of the National Rural Sector Program, or Programme National du Secteur Rurale (PNSR).	Building on the partnership established and the database developed.	CCAFS	48	Workshop report / scenarios used and scenario guided policy recommendations.
Ghana – Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) - Livestock policy (2016)	Scenario-guided review of the Ghana Livestock Policy	The Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) in the final stages of formulating the new Livestock Policy, workshop organized by MoFA, ICRISAT, CCAFS, CSIR and the CCAFS Ghana Science-Policy Platform.	Joint selection with all partners involved.	CCAFS	38	Workshop report / scenarios used and the recommendations for improvement of the policy generated.

Niger – Livestock sector plans (2019)	Scenario-guided review of the existing Niger Livestock Policy	Funded through USAID and partnership with University of Florida, organized by the Livestock Systems Innovation Lab (LSIL), scenario workshop to review and offer recommendations pertinent to the existing Livestock Policy which was introduced 7 years prior.	Building on networks established.	CCAFS/Univ ersity of Florida/ LSIL	44	Workshop report / recommendations per axis to the existing livestock policy.
---	--	--	--------------------------------------	---	----	--

Table 7

Scenario (Year)	Nb of women (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from women's organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from youth organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion
Burkina Faso (2015)	6 (12.5%)	/	/	3 (6.25%)
Ghana (2016)	8 (21.05%)	/	/	1 (2.63%)
Niger (2019)	4 (9.09%)	/	/	7 (15.91%)

As Table 7 indicates, none of the scenarios in Western Africa reached gender parity in participation. The Ghana scenario scored the highest with 21.09% while Niger scored the lowest with only 9.09% of participants being women. As was the case for Latin America, consideration of diversity of participants focused more on inviting stakeholders from different sectors to ensure a mix of government representatives, private sector, academia, or civil society. The CCAFS team for Western Africa pointed out that special emphasis is often put on getting stakeholders from different departments to broaden the scope of reflections for the policy under discussion, encouraging systems thinking. Efforts were also made towards including more marginalized groups representing smallholders, women, or youth, but in practice, the CCAFS team reflected that often, there is little permanent presence in the countries itself and the selection of participants often relied on the existing network developed by the government or other CG centres. This usually leads to more representation from government bodies and less so from civil society organizations, including marginalized groups. For instance, the scenario process in Ghana was noted to build on the Science-Policy platform established with mostly participants from government and academia. In contexts where there are more long-standing relations established with the government, it can also be easier to push further the government to send more women participants to the workshop as a team member reflected that he was able to joke to a department he had worked with for a long time that he would cancel the event if they did not diversify the participants list more. Time constraints were also noted to further restrict more attention to the participants lists, especially in instances where the use of scenario processes was more opportunistic.

Similarly to the Latin America scenario processes, the workshops in West Africa used diverse methods to facilitate effective participation such as individual brainstorming on post-its before coming together in small group discussions. The facilitation was mostly CCAFS led with collaborations from partners. The CCAFS team noted that a lack of time for the training of the facilitation team also meant that the trainings were focused mainly on explaining future thinking and the methods used. In some cases such as the Burkina Faso workshop, the CCAFS team reflected that they had also try to encourage active participation from the few women participants during the workshops for instance by giving them an active role in the breakout groups to try to bring out different perspectives.

Nonetheless, specific prompts during the workshops led to better consideration of gender and social inclusion issues. In the case of Ghana, the workshop facilitation team specifically prompted participants to think through the implications of the scenario developed for each of Ghana's regions, using of a map to make participants pinpoint the geography of the developments mentioned and think through cross-scale dynamics. Moreover, during the scenarios' adaptation, participants

were also prompted to think through five broad contextual developments which included socio-economic and demographic developments as well as culture, norms, and values, which often led to discussions on gender, youth, and social inequalities.

“These are scenarios about broad societal changes which could happen in the coming decades so we take into account political developments, socio-economic developments, ecological developments, and of course climate change, but also developments in terms of values and rights, like changing diet can also be part of a scenario. That’s also one of the rationales behind using the scenarios approach, we use contextual explorative scenarios we can broaden the scope” *CCAFS team, West Africa*

Interestingly, the CCAFS team noted that in some instances, age of participants also played an important role in power dynamics during workshops with seniority of participants weighting heavily on discussions. As the invitations for participation go first to high-level stakeholders, this tends to lead to more senior participants unless they designate younger experts to come. More recent workshops, such as the Niger one, were noted to have included more outspoken youthful voices, maybe prompted by the higher number of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion.

Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content

Table 8

Elements considered Case	Gender(s)	Youth	Socio-economic disparities	People living with disabilities (PLWDs)	Geographical disparities	Conclusions and cross sectional reading by participants relevant to G&SI.
Burkina Faso – PNSR (2015)	3 – agricultural enterprises for women, consideration of gender in natural resource exploitation, mention setting up a fund for agricultural enterprise, gender seen as low priority for the short term, *target for making productive lands more available to women, reducing malnutrition among women, access to employment in the agricultural sector in the final policy	3 – agricultural enterprise for youth, mention setting up a fund for the same, *targets for the youth in the final policy towards capacity building and employment	3 – Considering land tenure for smallholder farmers, livestock productivity of smallholders, equitable revenues from natural resources, rural poor, food insecurity for the vulnerable, *referring to social protection measures in the final policy, targets to reduce poverty and food insecurity for most vulnerable	0 – not mentioned	3 – Rural areas not being taken into account enough, rural urban migration, rural infrastructure needed, *targets for different zones in the country, both agricultural and pastoral lands and some measures for urban areas.	Capacity building needs mentioned, highlighting needs for inclusive participation involving different sectors and social categories, some gender disaggregated targets set.
Ghana (2016)	1 – Mentioning increased employment of women and family labour management transitions amid changing gender relations	1 – mentioning plans for youth in agriculture program, opportunities in agriculture for youth	2 – mentioning resource allocation, unemployed and purchasing power, small scale farmers, social differentiation in access to land / recommendations for taking into account indigenous knowledge, poor rural livelihoods and farmers-herdes conflict linked to land use issues following increasing large scale agricultural commercialisation	0 – not mentioned	2 – mentioning effective decentralization, regional and district level and aspects happening in certain regions, rural/urban dynamics / recommendations for considering different regions and taking multi-level approach	Emphasis on stronger collaboration between different levels and considering multiple sectors
Niger (2019)	2 – gender equality improving with societal changes, promoting women access to land	2 – mentioning youth employment in agrobusinesses, online education for youth and changing morals and values, youth access to land and training	2 – mentioning small scale farmers and some left behind, access to resources for pastoralists, wealth inequalities	0 – not mentioned	2 – regional disparities, mentioning instability in the north, migration tensions in the east and north, urbanization, pollution pastoral lands, rural marginalization, urbanization	Investment in capacity building and training, employment for youth and in pastoral areas, emphasis on land access.

As can be seen in Table 6, gender, youth, social and geographical disparities were often mentioned but few recommendations comported explicit targets. In the CCAFS West Africa region, references to social and geographical inequalities centred mostly on access to resources, including land while cross cutting issues emphasised capacity building and collaboration between actors and levels.

The Burkina Faso process brought forward detailed attention with multiple targets towards gender and social inclusion in the final policy. However, in the case of Burkina Faso, it seems that the use of a worst case scenario made participants more willing to focus on factors viewed as more directly threatening compared to gender equality which was qualified as a low priority for the short term. In the case of the Ghana and Niger scenario processes, the influence of the prompts on contextual development are visible as both scenario processes refer to cultural and social change and thinking through impacts on women and youth. However, this did not translate into specific recommendations for the policy.

None of the scenarios considered the intersectionality of factors with women and youth being used as definite categories with less exploration of intersectional social differentiation such as differentiated access to land for pastoral women and men. People living with disabilities were not considered in all scenarios.

The CCAFS team pointed out that the format of the scenarios, building on an existing policy, also restricted the scope or manoeuvre:

“The new adapted updated policy based on the scenarios recommendations is very much in line in terms of content with the original version of the policy so if there is a paragraph about climate smart agriculture, it is still going to be about climate smart agriculture in the end, but it is informed by the lessons learnt from the scenarios based exercise but, of course, sometimes it adds elements but not that often” *CCAFS team. West Africa*

The Ghanaian proposed policy did comport already an explicit section on gender inequality which considered women, youth and people living with disabilities, but the scenario process did not lead to discussions on that section or improvements on the same as other areas of the policy were under focus.

Synthesis for the WA region

Gaps

- Reliance on the network of governments and CG centres often leads to more participants from government bodies and related organizations and less representation from civil society organizations.
- Diversity in participants is often considered in terms of sectors and not necessarily following gender / social inclusion criteria.
- Lack of dedicated time is the biggest hindering factor to further integration.
- Use of worst case scenarios with multiple threats can make participants classify gender equality as low priority in comparison.
- Issues pertinent to people living with disabilities were not considered during the scenario processes.

Opportunities

- Specific prompts towards considering geographical disparities or contextual developments associated with the scenarios developed were instrumental in bringing forward gender and social inclusion issues.
- When scenarios refer to gender and social inclusion issues, one could prompt further to elicit recommendations on the same for the policies.

East Africa scenarios:

In the CCAFS East Africa region, two scenario processes were selected for further analysis, the scenario process to review the Tanzania's Environmental Policy and the scenario process surrounding the Rwandan Livestock Plan (see Table 7). As for the other regions, the national scenario processes built on the regional scenarios created this time for East Africa which had brought forward two main drivers of change with high uncertainty to be considered, namely the level of regional integration and mode of governance. Both scenario processes inscribed themselves within longer projects meant to bring stakeholders together to influence policies around the environment, agriculture, and climate change.

Table 9

Scenario guided process (Year)	Primary purpose	Context	Selection of participants	Facilitation	Nb of participants	Main documents considered
Tanzania (2015)	Revision of the National Environmental Policy	Part of the Policy Action for Climate Change Adaptation (PACCA) project.	PACCA/CCAFS	CCAFS	/	Workshop report, scenarios and recommendations
Rwanda (2019)	Review of the Livestock Master Plan	Livestock Systems Innovation Lab with University of Florida	LSIL/CCAFS	CCAFS/UF	36	Workshop report, scenarios and recommendations / priorities emerging

Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage

Table 10

Scenario (Year) ¹	Nb of women (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from women's organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from youth organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion
Rwanda (2019)	5 (13.89%)	/	/	/

For the Rwanda scenario process, women participants represented 13.89% of the total attendees. The CCAFS team noted that wider participation also depended on governments' willingness to invite stakeholders from other sectors, including the civil society, which was sometimes complicated in this region. Lack of time and reliance on existing networks further played into the participants selection. Age and seniority were also noted to have played a big role in shaping power dynamics during the workshop, even if more recent process had more youthful voices.

¹ Unfortunately, the participants list for Tanzania could not be retrieved at this point.

Similarly to the scenario processes in the CCAFS WA region, the scenario process in Rwanda invited participants to think through broader contextual development, mainly political and institutional developments, socio-economic and demographic developments, culture, norms and values, technological developments and science, natural resources and ecological developments. For the Tanzania workshop which based itself on a draft policy which was quite broad already, small groups were made with each group looking at different aspects of the policy with gender being an explicit category in one of the groups. The groups then refined the East Africa regions scenarios to the Tanzanian context and explored how the categories under each policy axis would fit within each scenario, this allowed for more detailed attention to different themes and their possible implications, including to some extent ones relevant to gender and social inclusion.

Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content

Table 11

Elements considered Case	Gender(s)	Youth	Socio-economic disparities	People living with disabilities (PLWDs)	Geographical disparities	Conclusions and cross sectional reading by participants relevant to G&SI.
Tanzania (2015)	1 – mentioning increasing vulnerability to climate change for women, men migration to urban centres, and increasing labour burden for women, women's marginalization from land ownership, inequalities in access to resources between men and women	1/2 – mentioning increasing vulnerability to climate change for youth / recommendation for education on sustainability	2 – mentioning increasing vulnerability of elderly, increasing land access and conflicts between smallholders, rising wealth gap and impacts on poorest and associated adaptive capacities, inequalities in service access and inadequate nutrition for the poor / recommendation to take care of less privileged	0 – not mentioned	2 – climate change challenges to rural Tanzanians, crop productivity decline in regions, benefits in colder regions, rural/urban migration / recommendation to improve services in rural areas and urban planning, decentralization	Emphasis on capacity building and raising awareness as well as participation.
Rwanda (2019)	2 – mentioning gender integration, women entrepreneurship / recommendation to improve gender integration in all sectors and among all groups	1 – mentioning changing mindset, entrepreneurship for the youth, youth immigration and outmigration	2 – mentioning persisting inequalities and increase in wealth differentiation, smallholder farmers, chronic poverty, land scarcity, different access to resources / recommendation to subsidize cost of medicine to poor farmers and improve local cold chain	0 – not mentioned	1 – rural/urban dynamics with rural areas left behind, high prices and taxes in cities, encroachment in park areas	Emphasis on capacity building and promoting entrepreneurship of women and youth

In the CCAFS East Africa region, all scenarios mentioned issues relevant to gender and social inclusion, but this mostly did not translate into specific recommendations for the policies. Capacity building was emphasized across in both cases.

Interestingly, while gender issues in particular, women's access to resources, were mentioned in the scenarios developed for Tanzania, the output document does not comport explicit recommendations on gender. However, the earlier references comport an instance which considers both men and women labour roles, thus taking an approach to gender that sees it not only as a woman's issue but considering the household dynamics. The recommendations across for social inclusion issues remain quite limited with no explicit targets or indicators. The Tanzanian scenarios comport an explicit reference to a specific group of livestock keepers which are due to be very affected by climate change's negative impacts, namely the Maasais, with some text on possibility for livelihood diversification. Issues related to people living with disabilities remain unconsidered in both scenario processes for East Africa.

For Rwanda, the adapted scenarios were then used to think through the different value chains for each types of livestock considered in the Livestock Master Plan and associated animal products. This meant the focus was more on the technologies and regulating policies surrounding animal health, feeds, etc with few considerations of gender and social inclusion issues. Similarly, there are few explicit recommendations or priorities set with the ones present remaining quite broad such as the recommendation to improve gender integration.

Synthesis for the EA region

Gaps

- Wider inclusion of participants is constrained by governments' willingness, time available and exiting networks drawn from.
- While gender and social inclusion elements are found in the scenarios, explicit and targeted recommendations on the same are missing.
- Issues pertinent to people living with disabilities are not considered.

Opportunities

- Integration of gender issues which consider relational household level dynamics, both men and women.
- Using contextual developments prompts during refinements of the scenarios, for instance on socio-economic and demographic developments, can stir discussions towards gender and social inclusion issues.

South East Asia scenarios:

In South East Asia, three scenario processes were selected for analysis (see Table 10). Two of these scenario processes, the 2014/2015 Cambodia review of the action plan for agriculture and the 2020 Lao People's Democratic Republic review of the vision for the agricultural sector, followed the usual format of using contextualized regional scenarios to the country's context to review and refine draft policies while the Cambodia COP training was slightly different with multiple sessions taking place over an extended period of time with an explicit capacity development angle.

In South East Asia, regional scenarios were developed from 2013 with 65 participants from Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos taking part in the process. A regional workshop to develop the qualitative scenarios considering food security, environment and livelihood dynamics was held in November 2013 with 30 participants in Ha Long Bay, Vietnam. CCAFS also conducted a stakeholder analysis, trying to map actors with influence, policymakers, agents of change and knowledge brokers in the region on topics related to climate smart agriculture. During the regional workshop, multiple drivers of change were decided upon – with 4 main ones considered as priority drivers of changes being markets, enforcement capacity and regional collaboration, agricultural investment and land degradation through land use change – but also pushed participants to consider additional factors of change, including the gap between the poor and the rich as well as gender equality which stirred discussions towards gender and social inclusion. Moreover, the Cambodian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) took part in the regional workshop which set the scene for more collaboration with an arrangement decided during that time for a national workshop in Cambodia to review the draft action plan for agriculture.

Table 12

Scenario guided process (Year)	Primary purpose	Context	Selection of participants	Facilitation	Nb of participants	Main documents considered
Cambodia Action Plan for Agriculture (2014/2015)	To review and feed into the 2014-2015 Action Plan for Agriculture - Climate Change Priorities Action Plan	Over nine months collaboration with Cambodian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), use scenarios approach to think through the action plan	MAFF/CCAFS – informed by stakeholder analysis	CCAFS	23	Cambodia's Climate Change Priorities Action Plan for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 2014-2018 output document / proposed priorities actions and costing
Cambodia COP training (2019)	To use scenarios approach as part of a training for Cambodia climate negotiators to prepare for COP	10 month Parliamentary diplomacy training program on climate change related issues, organized by the Parliamentary Institute of Cambodia (PIC), with the technical support CCAFS and the University of Utrecht	Department led, following criteria set by CCAFS	CCAFS	24	Training of participants.
Lao People's Democratic Republic (2020)	Test of the draft policy, Vision to the Year 2030 Vision of the Agriculture Sector for LAO PDR through scenario workshop	Presentation on scenarios approach and use of it to think through the agriculture development strategy	Government / CCAFS	CCAFS	21	16 scenarios developed (SAMIS) and training notes, story book and handbooks developed.

Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage

Table 13

Scenario (Year)	Nb of women (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from women's organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from youth organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion
Cambodia² (2013)	2 (8.7%)	1?		
Cambodia COP training (2019)	11 (45.83%)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lao People Democratic Republic (2020)	7 (33.33%)	N/A	N/A	N/A

As noted in the context section for SEA, the scenario process in Cambodia with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) followed the regional workshop as participants wished to use the future thinking methods to review and test the action plan for agriculture (CCPAP) that was already drafted. The collaboration took place over a period of nine months with the refining of the regional scenarios to Cambodia's context. However, the CCPAP was intended from the start as a document setting priorities and budget lines for action items before seeking funding for the different priority areas from donors. This context is important to understand as it shaped the process, including participation, as there was the wish keep consultations more internal to avoid some degree of external influence in the settings of priorities.

For the Cambodia climate change action plan, the number of women participating in the workshop was quite limited. The CCAFS team also noted that while representatives from the women and social affairs departments are often invited, there are few instances where a representative came and, the representative often tended to be junior. In the Cambodian case, most of the women participants were junior with only one holding a more senior position. Nonetheless, the process helped to start developing a relationship with the Women Affairs department which sent a representative – the interest coming from the fact that the department of Women Affairs also had to develop a climate strategy at the time. Funding was mentioned as a major constraint to get more organizations to participate. Organizations invited also had to be approved by governments. In the Cambodia case, the CCAFS team also reflected that the high turnover of civil servants can also hinder the building of strong relationships over time. This was noted to be less the case in Lao People's Democratic Republic as the civil servants remain the same due to the different political set up.

For the training with the Parliamentary Institute of Cambodia (PIC) for climate parliamentary diplomacy to the COP, the government departments selected candidates, but CCAFS could also input on the list provided by bringing forward some selection criteria. The latter were more towards minimum qualifications than gender and social inclusion issues but as participants were more from the technical side, being the people in charge of developing briefing and speeches as well as organizing meetings for senior executives, there tended to be more representation from women and younger people. The CCAFS team noted that as participants were also roughly from the same age category, interactions were easy and some of the dynamics for gender and social inclusion came up more easily – especially with more women in the room. Ongoing processes within governments were also sometimes favourable to bringing forward issues of gender and social inclusion. The CCAFS team noted that when the COP training for parliamentarians in Cambodia happened, the government had been

² The participant lists consulted only comport the attendees that were sponsored by CCAFS.

working closely on gender issues for a year to align with international frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In Lao's PDR, the scenario process also took the shape of a training with sessions dedicated to introducing the scenario approach before developing sets of scenarios, 16 scenarios were created in this case, before discussing impact pathways. The CCAFS team noted that there were specific prompts to stir discussions of geographical impacts for each scenario with participants identifying green, yellow and red zones for impacts and focusing on targeted crops. This was also thanks to a close partnership with the modelling and climate insight team but also largely due to more time – and funding – being available for this specific scenario process which took place over a period of two months and a half in total. This allowed to explore deeper some topics as well with “cultural and gender context” being considered as one of the axes for one of the set of scenarios.

“Being able to have that two months of kind of flexibility and readjusting the different material all the time with the different questions and being sure that we were not forgetting some of the aspects and being sure that we were responding as well to some of the needs, that was really good. Because when you do a training on three or four days, you just have the mission to do what you had planned. But when you have that kind of space and time, you can reformulate, you can integrate. And the participant itself have that time to digest. Come back with their own question. Come back with their own things. At that time factor is just it's really a luxury.” *CCAFS team, South East Asia*

In the Cambodia CCPAP case and the Lao People's Democratic Republic review of the vision for the agricultural sector, the team in SEA also used role plays as a way of shifting power dynamics in the room and encourage different stakeholders to join in. Role plays were also used in the capacity development activities with the trainees for the COP as negotiation is a key part of the COP processes. The CCAFS team also noted that the strength of the future thinking approach is also to make participants think of the future in a way that take away the responsibility of the present:

“Some of the stakeholders were divided into groups of key stakeholders of change in the agricultural sector. So some of them will have to act as farmers. Some of them will have to act as the policy makers. Some of them as the market as well, and because of that, there was that kind of safe place because everyone had a different role, and everyone will take the place of someone else. So it was not just talking as I am the government, it was taking that kind of exercise in such a light way for them to deresponsibilize the way they are thinking about the future so that they can actually be creative about the future.” *CCAFS team, South East Asia*

Moreover, future plans for the scenario approach in Lao PDR build on the scenario process to plan for participatory forest and agricultural land use planning with recommendations to include a wide variety of local stakeholders such as local organizations consisting of both men and women and multiple ethnic groups and also use role plays. The CCPAP scenario process in Cambodia was also unique in bringing forward a detailed budget per action points, many related to gender, with the team reflecting on the importance to probe on these questions:

“Well, I think it was to really to ask the questions about what the world will look like with more, gender sensitive agriculture practice and agriculture technology. I think that that's kind of really like help a lot.” / “We are looking about how to spend money, where to spend money and on who. So it was really important to really bring that four set of scenarios on that one and understanding as well with them.” *CCAFS team, South East Asia*

Creating the space for inclusive participation during the workshops themselves as well as active probing is key but can be challenging in context where there is less knowledge of existing power dynamics. The team leader noted that due to more knowledge on Cambodia and Cambodian language skills, it was slightly easier to comprehend and work with the context in Cambodia. Similarly to West and East Africa, age and seniority was also noted to play an important role with difficulty for younger people to contradict older established colleagues.

Elements considered Case	Gender(s)	Youth	Socio-economic disparities	People living with disabilities (PLWDs)	Geographical disparities	Conclusions and cross sectional reading by participants relevant to G&SI.
Cambodia (2013)	2 – cross cutting priorities include to promote marginalized groups and women participation to climate change adaptation and mitigation strategy with budget allocated / *4 – many references throughout the final document and cross cutting target to promote marginalized groups and women participation to climate change adaptation and mitigation strategy with budget allocated, target for more research on women in agriculture, to target fisherwomen, to improve adaptive capacities, link to farmers cooperatives.	0 – not mentioned	2 – mentioning limited capacities to adapt and stronger exposure to climate change for small and medium livestock keepers, cross cutting priorities include to promote marginalized groups and women participation to climate change adaptation and mitigation strategy with budget allocated / *4 – many references throughout the final document to impacts on poorest with cross cutting target to promote marginalized groups and women participation to climate change adaptation and mitigation strategy with budget allocated, indicator for improvement of rural income	0 – not mentioned	2 – mentioning different areas' challenges, main outcomes expected include increasing incomes in areas vulnerable to climate change as well as mapping of areas for different land uses, priorities action include different cropping per AEZs / *4 – mentioning different regions of the country and specific vulnerabilities, target to develop different interventions suitable to each AEZs with budget	Emphasis on capacity development for different actors with budget
Lao PDR (2020)	3 – mentioning cultural and social change with effects on women and men, household labours, inequalities between gender in decision making and management of resources / gender inequality in production and child labour identified as gap, identification of knowledge gaps and recommendation for engagement with women's organization and policies from the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare	1 – mentioning food and income insecurity for the youth and youth migration to urban areas	3 – mentioning food and income insecurity, different impacts on different ethnic groups / poverty in farming households due to low yield and income, recommendation to reduce poverty of farmers, different recommendations to increase access to resources including inputs and information and alternative activities	0 – not mentioned	3 – rural urban migration / changes in rural and urban population as drivers / considering different regions and changing suitability for crops, recommendation for land use zonation, to develop techniques and methods as well as crops suitable to local conditions,	Emphasis on inclusion of different stakeholders and empowering farmers especially

The Cambodia COP training is not included in the table as the output was more the training itself and not necessarily a specific document.

Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content

While the CCPAP goes a long way in including considerations of gender, social and geographical inequalities, the attention to youth is lacking as well as to issues related to people living with disabilities. The attention to social change was already present in the regional workshop which made it easier to integrate in the scenario process for the CCPAP as well, with for instance many discussions of what the future would look like in 2030 with the transition from subsistence to commercial agriculture and women entrepreneurs, changing roles and responsibilities. Moreover, the CCAFS team noted that focusing on specific practices and associated livelihoods such as agroforestry stirred the discussion towards marginalized ethnic groups living in the mountainous areas of Cambodia who are often overlooked in policy processes.

“It was a way to integrate that and if I recall, we talk a lot about agroforestry as well and forest management. So as a livelihood that can describe those marginalized group.” *CCAFS team, South East Asia*

For the Lao PDR scenario workshop, having “changing cultural and gender context” as one of the axes in one set of the scenarios was instrumental in bringing out many gender dynamics in the scenarios. Interestingly, the framing also allows for consideration of both genders, considering men and women’s roles relationally, and not framing gender as women only. However, the intersection of factor is not considered. The Lao PDR scenario workshop also brought forward discussion of inequalities and of differentiated impacts for different ethnic groups in the country as well as rural/urban and other geographical disparities. This was facilitated with the use of agro-ecological zones (AEZs) map during the second part of the training which prompted to think through the future of four different crops and their areas of cultivation – paddy rice, coffee, cassava, and maize – against changing climatic conditions. This was instrumental in focusing the discussions and bringing out concerns and opportunities for the people linked to the livelihoods associated with these crops.

The CCAFS team reflected that it became easier in recent years to bring forward more strongly gender and social inclusion issues due to the regional and international context and booming gender policies.

Synthesis for the SEA region

Gaps

- Time, funding available and governments’ aims restrict the scope of manoeuvre for participation and inclusion of topics.
- It remains difficult to invite women participants and especially to have women in senior positions.
- Turnover in governments can make it difficult to continue building strong relationship.
- Issues pertinent to people living with disabilities were not considered.

Opportunities

- Scenario processes that take place over a longer period of time provide more opportunities and the flexibility to explore gender and social inclusion issues.
- Sessions with participants of similar age and background make it easier to bring out these issues.
- Role plays and effective prompts can help to level the playing field for effective participation and bring out issues.

South Asia scenarios:

In South Asia, two scenarios were considered for analysis (see Table 14). The first one, held in 2014, fed directly into a policy formulation process, namely of the 7th Five Year Plan for Bangladesh. The second scenario process, the Zero Hunger, Zero Emission (ZHZE) was not directly linked to a policy but aimed at bringing different groups together in conversation. For the Zero Hunger / Zero Emissions workshops, new scenarios were developed for Bangladesh where two main axes were decided upon, namely the type of governance system and the type of environmental management.

Scenario guided process (Year)	Primary purpose	Context	Selection of participants	Facilitation	Nb of participants	Main documents considered
Bangladesh 7th Five Year Plan (2014)	To review and feed into the 7 th Five Year Plan	International Centre for Climate Change (ICCCAD)	CCAFS	CCAFS	/	Scenarios
Bangladesh Zero Hunger / Zero Emissions (2018)	To bring different groups together in discussions around food security and climate change related issues.	Partnership between CCAFS, the University of Oxford, Oxfam, ICCCAD and the Planning Commission of the Government of Bangladesh	CCAFS / Oxfam	CCAFS	1 - 48 3 - 37 2 - 42	Scenarios

Integration of gender and social inclusion considerations at the planning and implementation stage

Scenario (Year) ³	Nb of women (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from women's organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from youth organizations (% of participants)	Nb of representatives from national organizations working on social inclusion
Bangladesh Zero Hunger, Zero Emissions (2018)	1 – 13 (27.08%) 2 - 14 (37.84%) 3 – 12 (28.57%)	/	/	1 - 4 (8.33%) 2 - 4 (10.81%) 3 - /

³ The participants list for the Bangladesh 7th Five Year Plan could not be retrieved at this point.

The CCAFS team in South Asia noted that inclusion of gender and social inclusion considerations in participation for the workshop surrounding the development of the 7th Five Year Plan in Bangladesh was complicated by the fact that the scenario-guided policy formulation process was planned opportunistically at the demand of the government. There was thus limited time for planning and implementation with the attention focused on gathering the inputs necessary for the output. Furthermore, in this context, the CCAFS team worked directly with high-level government stakeholders in a relatively small circle as they were directly from the department developing the plan. These factors contributed to few non-governmental participants taking part and can also explain the low number of women participants. With invitations going towards high-level stakeholders, the CCAFS team highlighted the challenge of inviting and ensuring that many women participants come to the scenario-guided policy formulation process as it is unlikely that they occupy many senior positions. Similarly, inviting younger participants was also noted to be a challenge as well as taking youthful voices seriously enough into account.

However, for the Zero Hunger / Zero Emission scenario process, the room to maneuver was greater due to more time and funding available. While not having a direct policy output, this scenario processes succeeded in bringing together different groups to develop new scenarios for Bangladesh and compare their alignment with current policies on climate change and food security over the course of two workshops and one learning event. For this, separate side processes were also planned for with four consultations with various community groups. In particular, there were conversations with youth groups, including students. Representatives from the youth groups also took part in the main workshops but care had been taken beforehand to record the concerns expressed in the side consultations meetings and present them during the second workshop to ensure that those would be taken into account even with high power differential:

“We did the separate two-day residential consultations with the youth group for the Zero Hunger Zero Emissions scenarios and that was extremely successful. We then invited representatives from that group to come to the main process, so we knew what they wanted to kind of feed into the main process already, even if they weren't completely comfortable invoicing all their concerns or didn't have the time and space to do it at the main process. It's important that we factor in time and space for these various groups.” (*CCAFS South Asia team*)

In this context, the CCAFS team also emphasized the need for the CCAFS facilitators to act as a bridge and work on the language and format to bring different stakeholders together. In the case of the Zero Hunger / Zero Emissions, the process of reaching out and organizing consultations was also facilitated by a partnership with Oxfam Great Britain and Oxfam Bangladesh who could draw on their networks and understanding of gender and social inclusion to organize the side meetings. The CCAFS team pointed out that this partnership was especially instrumental in keeping the focus on inclusivity amid competing priorities for the workshop due to limited time and a small organizing team.

Similar to other CCAFS regions, the CCAFS team in South Asia reflected that over time, addressing and including these concerns had also become easier. Lessons have also been learnt surrounding the scenario processes with more attention and care put into the selection of participants for greater gender and social inclusion. This also came from the increased awareness that earlier scenario processes had not been as open as is needed for inclusive future planning.

Elements considered Case ⁴	Gender(s)	Youth	Socio-economic disparities	People living with disabilities (PLWDs)	Geographical disparities	Conclusions and cross sectional reading by participants relevant to G&SI.
Bangladesh (2018)⁵	2 - considering enduring gender inequality and tension at the household level, women feeling more secure and having more political power and education, need for literacy for both men and women, discussing role of women in paving low carbon pathways	2 - youth being less attracted to employment in agriculture, problem of addiction by young people. need for education and awareness	2 - mentioning potential increasing social and economic inequalities, unemployment, social unrest, availability of GMOs for poorer people and differences in food choices available based on social class, considering small scale farmers, unequal and excessively polluting society for the poor	0 - not mentioned	2 - increase in solar panels in rural areas and consequences of urbanization, industrialisation and larger farms with commercial agriculture	Emphasizing participation in decision making, importance to work with civil society groups

Level of integration of gender and social inclusion in content

For the Zero Hunger / Zero emission scenario workshop, several breakout groups were made with specific points to consider, several being relevant to gender and social inclusion issues such as prompts to consider implications for the poor and marginalized and for youth groups or civil society. The scenario narratives also point out the needs to think through several elements on gender, youth, socio-economic and geographical disparities. The elements on gender include the consideration of women's role in processes of change linked to low carbon transitions with cross-sectional issues emphasizing the need for broader participation in decision-making. There is no integration of issues relevant to people living with disabilities.

Synthesis for the SA region

Gaps

- Lack of time, funding, and human resources constraints the capacity to take into account gender and social inclusion consideration.
- Invitations to participate going to higher-level stakeholders means a skewed distribution with few women and young people invited.
- Issues pertinent to people living with disabilities were not considered.

Opportunities

- Separate side consultations which then feed into the main workshop can help bring forward diverse voices even with high power differential.

⁴ The documents related to the 7th Five Year Plan workshop could not be retrieved at this point.

⁵ Only refers to the scenarios developed and associated narratives.

- Collaborations with organizations focused on gender and social organization can help to reach out and plan for consultations of different groups.

Discussion

Across all regions, gender and social inclusion issues were not the main focus of the scenario processes and were not explicitly considered during the planning and implementation of the scenario processes. This was identified as the main obstacle towards integration by the CCAFS team. However, many efforts were made to push for wider participation and to level the playing field during the workshop themselves by using different methods and formats to create a safe space for effective participation. To stir for more inclusion in the content, including social and cultural issues in the drivers of changes considered in scenario processes, probing for geographical impacts, engaging in side consultations and longer term engagement, was also instrumental in bringing out some considerations of gender and social inclusion in the recommendations.

Process participation: gaps and opportunities

As the results section highlight, only two scenario processes reached gender parity, the 2016 SICA CSA scenario-guided policy formulation process and the 2020 INDC enhancement process in Costa Rica, while another process was in the 40 to 50% range, one in the 30 to 40%, four were in the 20% to about 30% range of female attendees and four had less than 20% of attendees being women. There was also limited engagement with national and local women's groups as well as marginalized groups, although some cases such as the Honduras' participatory review of the SAG strategy had considerable representation of smallholder farmers. This can be explained by the fact that the CCAFS team primarily pushed for inclusion of different departments, sectors, and actors with perhaps, less attention to gender and social inclusion considerations. Likewise, limited planning time across all regions was noted to be the biggest hindering factor as some scenarios were opportunistic, working on a government's timeline and joined in at different stages of the policy development. The high time and energy cost of participatory scenario planning has been noted in the literature as a key challenge (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015). As most scenario processes are demand led by governments, it was also noted to be complicated to push for wider participation with limits to how much can be pushed for in some contexts, especially when policy makers do not wish to discuss policy content with a wider audience. The CCAFS team often used the efficiency argument, bringing forward that more diverse participation leads to better policy and the need for broad system thinking. Longer presence in the country and familiarity with the country's context from the CCAFS team can also facilitate this process as it fosters longer engagements with better knowledge of stakeholders and understanding of power dynamics.

Beyond inviting diverse participants, members of the team also noted the difficulty to have some groups join in. In some cases, it was noted to depend on the civil society/government relations at the time of the workshop as some participants from non-governmental organizations might not feel that their participation would matter enough to come. In some cases, groups less used to formal policy-making spaces might also not feel comfortable with the settings. Relying on existing networks in all regions might also mean the key participants identified are often very demanded, such as was noted to be the case for representatives of indigenous groups in Latin America, and not necessarily available or willing to engage. In other contexts, the democratic space is more restricted with important power dynamics, and it can be difficult to invite people beyond the choices made by the government. Facilitating effective participation from younger people is often uneasy as was noted to be the case in West and East Africa, South East Asia and South Asia with age and seniority in a given position play a big role, sometimes stronger than gender. It was also noted to be difficult to get women in senior roles to take part in the process while engaging with younger technical staff led to more gender balance in South East Asia.

Limited time for the training of facilitators prior to a workshop meant that the training of facilitators was focused on the future methods and did not address gender and social inclusion issues as many noted that the thinking behind the futures approach is already complex to grasp in a short time. While gender parity in facilitators was noted to be often doable, in countries with less permanent CCAFS presence, it was more difficult to get local facilitators who might understand better the national context. However, in some cases, facilitators were from governmental bodies partnered with when there were staff very interested in the process and open to feedback on the draft policy under review. This fosters better engagement with key stakeholders but could also reinforce power relations in the room and prevent participation of

some. The literature on scenario processes notes the trade-offs to consider between insider and outsider status of facilitators (Pereira *et al.*, 2019). Nonetheless, the trainings across regions emphasized the need to foster inclusive participation, looking out for people not speaking much and trying different ways to open discussions such as individual writing on post-its, changing groups, or using role plays to disrupt power relations in the case of South East Asia. In one case in Latin America, a hired consultant focused on gender and social inclusion was instrumental in bringing a more detailed focus on these issues, especially by moving around groups and probing on the impacts for women and youth. In the case of the Zero Hunger / Zero Emission workshop in Bangladesh, the partner, Oxfam, had expertise in these topics and could also push for inclusion before and during the meetings. As the CCAFS team reflected that often someone moves around sharing findings from the quantitative models to the small groups to enrich discussions, the same could also be planned for questions surrounding gender and social inclusion. Thinking through and integrating different ways to communicate with diverse stakeholders around future scenario processes, for instance through art and other creative activities, has also been suggested in the literature (Oteros-Rozas *et al.*, 2015; Laura Pereira *et al.*, 2021).

Members of the CCAFS team also noted that the emphasis on the future itself and not on current events also provide the space for more freedom of expression which is key as in some instances, participants were more used to working with models and quantitative data and seeing these as drivers of decision-making and were then less comfortable with qualitative scenarios and inclusive participatory processes. Focusing on exploring broader societal changes associated with each scenario was also instrumental in bringing out some consideration of gender and social inclusion as it pushed participants in some cases to reflect on changing societal norms, especially when it was directly put as a key driver to be considered. However, in the case of Burkina Faso, the focus on a scenario that brought forward many threatening elements also made the participants see gender equality as less important in comparison. Finding ways to make it relevant across and not just as a separate section is a key challenge.

Interestingly, in some cases, the COVID19 pandemic provided some opportunities for wider participation and inclusion. In the case of Latin America, the 2020 NDC process was done mostly online and enabled including a wider range of participants, including through some side processes which were more efficient in bringing in certain groups such as elderly and indigenous groups. The pandemic had also highlighted important gender and social inequalities concerns that the participants were keen to address. The experience in Costa Rica suggests that side processes could be used more widely to include different and often marginalized groups in reviewing the policies such as indigenous, LGTBQA+ or elderly, as it allows for consultations. This does not imply that these groups must be in the same room as very powerful actors and comply with formal meetings rules. In South East Asia, the coronavirus pandemic provided the opportunity to set up online training sessions over an extended period of time, which would have been difficult in normal times and meant more time to explore some topics, refine the approach and foster a conducive working environment. This might be more difficult to implement in non-pandemic times, but the approach over time allowed for more capacity strengthening and empowerment of participants, especially as the COP training was held with younger staff. These two elements, side processes and longer engagement, could be instrumental in moving beyond the efficiency argument for inclusion towards facilitating “equity and empowerment”, making participation a way to empower often marginalized groups.

Finally, to some extent, addressing and prompting on these issues during the workshops also depends on the sensitivity of the facilitators in each region. Some felt it was not their area of expertise or focus while others reflected that they had tried in different ways to integrate these concerns. One of the facilitators reflected that it is sometimes easier as a woman to bring up these issues in some contexts, being almost expected as normal for a woman to care about gender inequalities and discuss it in ways that might be more difficult for men. In several instances, the facilitators across regions also reflected that it was easier to prompt for social inclusion issues than gender issues as the former already comes up very strongly in many cases, for instance surrounding indigenous groups in Latin America or pastoralists in West and East Africa. However, some members of the team also pointed out that gender issues have become easier to talk about in recent years compared to a few years ago due to the international context and different national contexts that fostered a conducive environment as was the case in Lao PDR where the national government had spent a year with a task force working on gender equality.

Key points:

- Gender parity in participation was achieved in only one scenario process. Targeting high level stakeholders can mean less women in positions to be invited while reliance on existing networks can limit the knowledge and inclusion of stakeholders beyond academia and governments.
- Limited time for planning as well as governments' willingness to extend invitations to a broader and more diverse audience were noted as key constraints across all regions.
- Longer presence in the country and familiarity with each country's context can help to push for wider inclusion.
- Side processes can also be an effective way to include often marginalised communities in different ways. Longer engagement over time gives more flexibility to choose topics to address and to bring in different groups.
- Different methods such as role plays, visual prompts or active probing were useful in levelling up the playing field during the workshops and pushing for the integration of gender and social inclusion considerations.
- As the scenario approach is complex, it was noted to be difficult to have the time to train the facilitators on gender and social inclusion. Facilitators are nonetheless key to facilitating discussions and can prompt for the integration of gender and social inclusion issues.
- Collaboration with experts on gender and social inclusion can bring valuable expertise to the team.

Inclusion of gender and social inclusion in content: gaps and opportunities

Across all regions, issues related to geographical disparities and to some extent, social inequalities, were the most likely to be mentioned and reported on in the outputs. Rural/urban dynamics often came out very strongly, mirroring the considerable issues for the agricultural sector of labour force migration to urban areas in many countries. Several scenario processes actively probed using maps such as in West Africa which was instrumental to get detailed explanations of differentiated geographical impacts envisioned in each scenario and for the eventual policy.

Gender and youth issues often came up in relation to disproportionate climate change impacts on women and vulnerable groups and when discussing needs for capacities building with a focus on education and employment opportunities for the youth. Few cases also considered access to productive resources and decision making and planned for gender disaggregated targets. Moreover, gender was often readily understood as women's issues in the text with very few cases adopting a relational lens or looking beyond binaries with only one case considered the intersectionality of factors. The integration of gender and youth was also mostly not systematic across the themes discussed and often put aside as a separate component. The disproportionate focus on capacity building and vulnerabilities to climate change meant that consideration of women and young people's rights, agencies and roles in a changing climate and linked to certain livelihoods were less likely to be acknowledged or considered. These findings are consistent with recent attempts to analyse the integration of gender in climate policies in particular which have singled out the continued lack of attention to structural constraints and to understanding women's own capacities as opposed to singling out only existing vulnerabilities in a broad sense and considering it a women's issue to be addressed in a different section (Ampaire *et al.*, 2020; Huyer *et al.*, 2020). This has consequences for the ways these policies are enacted with the risk that gender remains treated as an "add-on" and is not sufficiently prioritised and integrated at all stages as was the case in most of the GCF projects analysed by Schalteck, Zimmerman and McCullough (2021). Scholars have brought forward that dedicated capacity strengthening for policy-makers could be instrumental in creating the space to delve into these issues further, creating awareness on existing studies as well as gender and social inclusion policies in the country with the ultimate goal to ensure that gender is considered in a transformative way (Huyer *et al.*, 2020, p. 583).

When gender or social/cultural changes were included in the drivers/factors of change or prompted for actively, more considerations ensued and, critically, some discussions happened surrounding labour roles and responsibilities at the household level. However, in many instances, these discussions did not translate to recommendations or priorities set, which suggest that follow-ups may be needed when time allows. Similarly, focusing on key crops and livelihoods attached to these, brought up conversations of groups attached to these livelihoods in South East Asia, many of which are not often considered in policy making processes. This could be replicated in other contexts. In all CCAFS regions, the regional scenarios created also had a strong impact as they were decided as the starting point to adapt scenarios to the national context. As such, when some already had some elements related to gender and social inclusion, it was often adapted and kept in the national scenarios. This suggests the importance of setting the scene for gender and social inclusion already in those overarching scenario processes and particularly, in the drivers of changes / axis of transformation considered.

Across all regions and except for the 2020 NDC enhancement scenario process in Costa Rica, issues related to people living with disabilities were not considered at all which remains an important gap that the CCAFS scenario processes should try to address more in the future. The focus on agriculture and often talk of mechanisation and intensification was seen as less conducive to discussions about the labour force with discussions often focusing on land uses, especially when the policies under discussion already had some predetermined sections. Yet, this also means that the possible adverse effects of some of these planned changes for women and other marginalised groups remain unconsidered.

Similarly than for the process, the spaces to manoeuvre to integrate gender and social inclusion considerations in the content varies significantly from case to case and country to country, for instance in Costa Rica, the discussion on gender included references to sexually diverse populations and went beyond binaries which is often not possible in other countries which might not allow for such considerations. While addressing and integrating marginalized gender and sexualized identities is likely to be quite a challenge in many countries, thoughts should be put into how to do this, perhaps drawing from the successful example in Costa Rica which involved side consultations.

Finally, doubts were expressed on the way priorities set or recommendations made translate and materialize in practice beyond the policies. This mirrors findings from studies noting the increased trend in the mainstreaming of gender in climate policies with the caveat that this can remain superficial as this highly depends on a specific country's context and is not often linked to specific targets and dedicated financial resources which prevents it from going further than the policy (Nhamo, 2014; Huyer et al., 2020).

Key points:

- Geographical disparities were most likely to be mentioned, in particular rural/urban dynamics.
- The understanding of gender often frames it as women's issues with fewer cases adopting a relational lens and considering the intersectionality of factors.
- Emphasis on vulnerabilities to climate change and capacity building for marginalized groups, less often the consideration of different roles and capacities in a changing climate.
- Only one scenario considered issues relevant to people living with disabilities.
- When issues related to gender, youth or social inequalities were integrated, it often did not translate into recommendations or targets in the output documents.
- Adding social and cultural drivers in the contextual developments that participants must consider when creating the scenarios was instrumental in bringing out gender and social inclusion issues. Focusing on specific crops or practices to discuss livelihoods and social groups attached can also stir discussions.

Recommendations:

1. **Make the integration of gender and social inclusion a priority from the onset:** At the early planning stage, dedicated time and funding should be allocated to ensure that gender and social inclusion considerations can be sufficiently addressed throughout the process, from facilitating wider diversity in participation to the designing of the scenarios and associated outputs. The trade-offs that are inherent in the different modes of stakeholder engagement including workshop formats should also be considered. For instance between one-time workshops with high-level stakeholders and quicker outputs versus longer engagement that allow for more flexibility in terms of participants and formats. Collaborations with external partners that have an expertise in gender and social inclusion and knowledge of each country's context such as NGOs or consultants can also be instrumental in ensuring that the efforts to integrate do not add to the workload of the organizing team but remains sufficiently prioritized and address contextual dynamics.
2. **Consider increasing side consultations in various forms with diverse organizations and groups:** Side consultations with often marginalized communities and groups, such as indigenous groups, women's organizations, or youth groups, could be planned more widely to gather diverse views and enable concerns and different existing capacities to be integrated in the scenarios developed at the national level without forcing

everyone to be in the same room. The learnings from the side consultations can then be disseminated during the main workshop along with existing research on these issues which could strengthen stakeholders' understandings and capacities. This can be helpful in contexts where there is reluctance from the main partners to open the workshop to non-governmental stakeholders. Moreover, this can also enable for side processes to take different formats which are more effective in communicating with diverse groups.

3. **Continue to use and develop methods that level the playing field during the workshop:** The team should continue to work with and draw from methods that have proven their value in promoting inclusive dialogue and levelling up power dynamics during the scenario workshops. Such methods include role-plays or the use of visual prompts with maps which are instrumental in stimulating discussions on specific issues that might be relevant to different regions and groups. The inclusion of social and cultural drivers of change in the list of contextual developments that participants are asked to consider when developing the scenarios can also effectively stir discussions.
4. **Reinforce the active role of facilitators in guiding discussion and following up:** As knowledge and understanding of the scenarios approach have now increased, facilitators can be further encouraged and trained to probe on gender and social inclusion issues during the scenario-guided policy formulation processes. This is particularly important for considerations that are less likely to come out easily such as issues important to people living with disabilities. Likewise, the facilitators could also help to ensure that the challenges that were raised for different groups during the explorative scenario development phase further translate to specific recommendations and targets in the outputs.
5. **Promote and disseminate existing research and documentation to strengthen capacities:** The scenario workshops should further build on and support the global momentum in recent years towards integrating gender and social inclusion. This could be done by disseminating results from recent research in each country on these topics and leveraging the national and international commitments made by the countries.
6. **Promote learning between different regions to discuss good practices across cases:** As this study has shown, each regional team has been involved in learning by doing with many lessons learnt across the years, sessions to share between different members of the organizing and facilitation teams could be useful.

WORKS CITED

- Ampaire, E. *et al.* (2016) *Gender responsive policy formulation and budgeting in Tanzania: do plans and budgets match ?*, CCAFS Info Note.
- Ampaire, E. L. *et al.* (2020) 'Gender in climate change, agriculture, and natural resource policies: insights from East Africa', *Climatic Change*, 158(1), pp. 43–60. doi: 10.1007/s10584-019-02447-0.
- Arthurson, K. and Baum, S. (2015) 'Making space for social inclusion in conceptualising climate change vulnerability', *Local Environment*, 20(1), pp. 1–17. doi: 10.1080/13549839.2013.818951.
- Bassett, T. J. and Fogelman, C. (2013) 'Déjà vu or something new? The adaptation concept in the climate change literature', *Geoforum*. Elsevier Ltd, 48, pp. 42–53. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.04.010.
- Burns, B. and Patouris, J. (2014) *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Decisions and Conclusions: Existing mandates and entry points for gender equality*. New York.
- Chanana-Nag, N. and Aggarwal, P. K. (2020) 'Woman in agriculture, and climate risks: hotspots for development', *Climatic Change*, 158(1), pp. 13–27. doi: 10.1007/s10584-018-2233-z.
- Chen, M. A. (1995) 'Engendering world conferences: The international women's movement and the United Nations', *Third World Quarterly*, pp. 477–494. doi: 10.1080/01436599550036013.
- Chingarande, D. *et al.* (2020) *Background paper on mainstreaming gender into National Adaptation Planning and implementation in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Available at: <https://ccafs.cgiar.org/donors>.
- Cleaver, F. (1999) 'Paradoxes of participation: Questioning participatory approaches to development', *Journal of International Development*, 11(4), pp. 597–612. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1328(199906)11:4<597::AID-JID610>3.0.CO;2-Q.
- Cornwall, A. (2008) 'Unpacking "Participation" Models, meanings and practices', *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), pp. 269–283. doi: 10.1093/cdj/bsn010.
- Edmunds, D., Sasser, J. and Wollenberg, E. (2013) 'A gender strategy for pro-poor climate change mitigation.', *CCAFS Working Paper*, (36), pp. 70-pp. Available at: <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/27765/WorkingPaper36.pdf?sequence=6>.
- Eriksen, S. *et al.* (2021) 'Adaptation interventions and their effect on vulnerability in developing countries: help, hindrance or irrelevance?', *World Development Review*. The Authors, 141, p. 105383. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105383.
- FAO and CCAFS (2013) *Training Guide - Gender and Climate Change Research In Agriculture and Food Security For Rural Development*.
- Farnworth, C. R. *et al.* (2017) 'Incorporating gender into low-emission development: A case study from Vietnam', *Gender, Technology and Development*. Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group, 21(1–2), pp. 5–30. doi: 10.1080/09718524.2017.1385314.
- Ferree, M. M. and Gamson, W. A. (2002) 'The Gendering of Governance and the Governance of Gender', in Hobson, B. (ed.) *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 35–63.
- Gaventa, J. (2011) *participation makes a difference But not always how and*, *Development Outreach*.
- Gaventa, J. and Barrett, G. (2012) 'Mapping the Outcomes of Citizen Engagement', *World Development*, 40(12), pp. 2399–2410. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.05.014.
- Gaventa, J. and Valderrama, C. (1999) *Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance*. doi: 10.1117/12.2308857.
- Gonda, N. (2016) 'Climate Change, "Technology" and Gender: "Adapting Women" to Climate Change with Cooking Stoves and Water Reservoirs', *Gender, Technology and Development*, 20(2), pp. 149–168. doi: 10.1177/0971852416639786.
- Gumucio, T. and Rueda, M. T. (2015) 'Influencing Gender-Inclusive Climate Change Policies in Latin America', *Journal of Gender, Agriculture and Food Security*, 1(2), pp. 42–61.

Howland, F., Le Coq, J.-F. and Acosta, M. (2019) *Gender integration in agriculture, food Security and climate change policy: a framework proposal Activity report*.

Huyer, S. *et al.* (2016) *CCAFS Gender and Social Inclusion Strategy CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS)*. Available at: <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/72900/WP171.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

Huyer, S. (2016a) 'Closing the Gender Gap in Agriculture', *Gender, Technology and Development*, 20(2), pp. 105–116. doi: 10.1177/0971852416643872.

Huyer, S. (2016b) *Gender equality in national climate action: Planning for gender-responsive nationally determined contributions, United Nations Development Programme*. Available at: https://www.unccllearn.org/sites/default/files/inventory/gender_equality_in_national_climate_action_1.pdf.

Huyer, S. *et al.* (2020) 'Can we turn the tide? Confronting gender inequality in climate policy', *Gender and Development*, 28(3), pp. 571–591. doi: 10.1080/13552074.2020.1836817.

Huyer, S. *et al.* (2021) 'Expanding Opportunities : A Framework for Gender and Socially-Inclusive Climate Resilient Agriculture', *Frontiers in Climate*, 3(December), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.3389/fclim.2021.718240.

IFAD (2017) 'Glossary on gender issues'. Available at: <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/d6027426-91b2-48d2-bb29-0c0ebbc05f5c>.

IUCN (2011) *Draft Guidelines to Mainstreaming Gender in the Development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)*. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/smsn/ngo/306.pdf>.

Kabeer, N. and Subrahmanian, R. (1996) *Institutions, relations and outcomes: Framework and tools for gender-aware planning*. Brighton. Available at: <http://eprints.uanl.mx/5481/1/1020149995.PDF>.

Kaijser, A. and Kronsell, A. (2014) 'Climate change through the lens of intersectionality', *Environmental Politics*. Routledge, 23(3), pp. 417–433. doi: 10.1080/09644016.2013.835203.

Krizsan, A. and Lombardo, E. (2013) 'The quality of gender equality policies: A discursive approach', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 20(1), pp. 77–92. doi: 10.1177/1350506812456462.

Mansuri, G. and Rao, V. (2012) *Localizing Development Does Participation Work?*, *The World Bank*.

Merrifield, J. (2002) *Learning citizenship*. England.

Mulema, A., Cramer, L. and Huyer, S. (2021) *Stakeholder engagement in gender and climate change policy processes: Lessons from CCAFS*.

Nhamo, G. and Nhamo, S. (2018) 'Gender and Geographical Balance: With a Focus on the UN Secretariat and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', *Gender Questions*, 5(1). doi: 10.25159/2412-8457/2520.

Nightingale, A. J. *et al.* (2019) 'Beyond Technical Fixes: climate solutions and the great derangement', *Climate and Development*. Taylor & Francis, 0(0), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1080/17565529.2019.1624495.

NORAD (2013) *A Framework for Analysing Participation in Development*.

Oteros-Rozas, E. *et al.* (2015) *Participatory scenario planning in place-based social-ecological research, Ecology and Society*. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26270296>.

Pereira, L. *et al.* (2019) 'Transformative spaces in the making: key lessons from nine cases in the Global South', *Sustainability Science*. Springer Japan, 15(1), pp. 161–178. doi: 10.1007/s11625-019-00749-x.

Pereira, Laura *et al.* (2021) 'Advancing a toolkit of diverse futures approaches for global environmental assessments', *Ecosystems and People*. Taylor & Francis, 17(1), pp. 191–204. doi: 10.1080/26395916.2021.1901783.

Pereira, L. *et al.* (2021) 'From Fairplay to Climate Wars: Making climate change scenarios more dynamic, creative and integrative', *Ecology and Society*, 26(4), p. In press.

Perez, C. *et al.* (2015) 'How resilient are farming households and communities to a changing climate in Africa? A gender-based perspective', *Global Environmental Change*, 34, pp. 95–107. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.06.003.

Ransom, P. (2006) 'Assessing empowerment: The role of women's organizations in global negotiations for persistent

organic pollutants', *Women and Health*, 44(3), pp. 43–60. doi: 10.1300/J013v44n03_03.

Rao, N. *et al.* (2019) 'Gendered vulnerabilities to climate change: insights from the semi-arid regions of Africa and Asia', *Climate and Development*. Taylor & Francis, 11(1), pp. 14–26. doi: 10.1080/17565529.2017.1372266.

Schalatek, L., Zuckerman, E. and Mccullough, E. (2021) *More than an add-on?* Washington, DC.

Tavenner, K. and Crane, T. A. (2018) 'Gender power in Kenyan dairy: cows, commodities, and commercialization', *Agriculture and Human Values*. Springer Netherlands, 35(3), pp. 701–715. doi: 10.1007/s10460-018-9867-3.

Wiebe, K. *et al.* (2018) 'Scenario development and foresight analysis: Exploring options to inform choices', *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 43, pp. 545–570. doi: 10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-030109.